Religious Education

THE JOURNAL OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Vol. VI. $3.00 a Year. 65c. a Copy. No. 3.

CONTENTS FOR AUGUST, 1911

STANDARDIZATION OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION - *Wm. D. Mackenzie* 253

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION - *Benj. S. Winchester* 261

CONVERSION AND MORAL INSTRUCTION - - - *Frederic M. Giles* 268

JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION - - - - - *Louis Grossman* 276

THE SMALL SUNDAY SCHOOL

POSSIBILITIES THROUGH CURRICULUM - - - *E. Morris Ferguson* 281

POSSIBILITIES THROUGH WORSHIP - - - - - *Carleton P. Mills* 287

POSSIBILITIES THROUGH TEACHER TRAINING - - *Franklin W. McElfresh* 292

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, entered as Second-Class Matter May 29, 1906, at the Post Office, at Chicago, Illinois, according to the Act of Congress of March 3d, 1879, is published bi-monthly by The Religious Education Association, General Secretary, Henry F. Cope, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

The Religious Education Association

GENERAL OFFICERS FOR 1911

President—James H. Kirkland, LL.D., Chancellor Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
First Vice-President—Rev. Charles R. Brown, LL.D.,D.D., Dean Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
Treasurer—Charles Lawrence Hutchinson, Vice-Pres. Corn Exchange National Bank, Chicago.
Recording Secretary—William Pierson Merrill, D.D., Pastor Brick Presbyterian Church, New York.
General Secretary—Henry Frederick Cope, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
Office of the Association, 332 So. Michigan Ave.

VICE PRESIDENTS

Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, S.T.D., Bishop Protestant Episcopal Church, Chicago, Ill.
Hon. Elmer E. Brown, Ph.D.,
Charles W. Eliot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Dean George Hodges, D.D., Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.
Pres. Jacob H. Schurman, LL.D., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Pres. A. Ross Hill, LL.D., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Prof. A. H. MacKay, Ph.D., Halifax, N. S.
Mr. Fleming H. Revell, New York, N. Y.
Mr. Robert C. Ogden, New York.
Pres. William O. Thompson, LL.D., State University of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.
Pres. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, L.L.D., President University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Mrs. Frederick Schoff, President National Congress of Mothers, Washington, D. C.
Robert A. Falconer, Litt.D., President Universiiy of Toronto, Canada.
Mr. Bird S. Coler, New York N. Y.

EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Seven General Officers, *ex-officio*, and

Rev. Wm. C. Bitting, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.
Prof. Geo. A. Coe, LL.D., New York.
Rt. Rev. William Fraser McDowell, S. T. D., Chicago.
Mr. David R. Forgan, Chicago.
Mr. Richard C. Hall, Chicago.
Mr. William N. Hartshorn, Boston.
Miss Caroline Hazard, LL.D., Wellesley, Mass.
Rev. Richard Cecil Hughes, D.D., Madison, Wis.
Prof. Herbert L. Willett, Ph.D., Chicago.
Pres. Harry Pratt Judson, LL.D., Chicago
Pres. Henry C. King, LL.D., Oberlin, Ohio.
Pres. Wm. D. Mackenzie, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.
Dean Shailer Mathews, D.D., Chicago.
Mr. L. Wilbur Messer, Chicago.
Prof. Francis G. Peabody, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Mr. Julius Rosenwald, Chicago.
Pres. Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., Topeka, Kas.
Rev. Charles M. Stuart, LL.D., Evanston, Ill.
Mr. Lucius Teter, Chicago.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Directors for Life.

Pres. Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., Topeka, Kas.
Rt. Rev. William Fraser McDowell, S.T.D., Chicago. Ill.
Pres. Wm. H. P. Faunce, LL.D., Providence, R. I.
Pres. Henry Churchill King, LL.D., Oberlin, Ohio.
Prof. Francis G. Peabody, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Geo. A. Coe, LL.D., New York, N. Y.
William Lawrence, LL.D., Bishop of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.

Directors at Large.

Pres. Charles R. Van Hise, LL.D., Madison, Wis.
Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, D.D., Boston, Mass.
Mr. Wirt S. Wiley, Minneapolis, Minn.
Rt. Rev. James DeWolf Perry, Providence, R. I.
Prof. Charles F. Kent, Ph.D., New Haven, Conn.
Pres. Ira Landrith, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.
Prof. John R. Mcfadyen, D.D. Glasgow, Scotland.
Pres. Samuel C. Mitchell, LL.D., Columbia, S. C.
Pres. George B. Stewart, LL.D., Auburn, N. Y.
Pres. Frank Strong, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
Pres. George E. Vincent, Ph.D., University of Minnesota.
Miss Jane Adams, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
Mr. Charles S. Holt, Chicago, Ill.
William H. Lewis, Seattle, Wash.
John R. Mott, New York, N. Y.
Arthur Black, Liverpool Education Commission, Liverpool, England.
Prof. J. D. Fleming, Lahore, Pinyal, India.
Galen M. Fisher, Tokyo, Japan.
Henry H. Lowry, D.D., Education Association of China, Pekin, China.

State Directors.

Calif.—Prof. Walter F. Bade, Ph.D., Berkeley Calif.
Col.—Rev. D. D. Forward, Greeley.
Conn.—Rev. Gerald H. Beard, Bridgeport.
D. C.—Pres. W. P. Thirkield, Washington.
Fla.—Lincoln H. Hulley, Ph.D., DeLand, Fla.
Ga.—Rev. Howard T. Cree, Augusta.
Ill.—Rev. Wm. Covert, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
Ind.—Robert L. Kelly, Ph.D., Pres. Earlham College, Richmond.
Iowa—Pres. John H. T. Main, Ph.D., Grinnell.
Kans.—Pres. Lemuel H. Murlin, D.D., Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.
Maine—Alfred W. Anthony, D.D., Lewiston.
Mass.—Mr. Arthur S. Johnson, Boston, Mass.
Mich.—Rev. A. W. Wishart, D.D., Grand Rapids.
Mo.—Prof. George Platt Knox, Ph.D., St. Louis.
N. Car.—Rev. W. R. Cullom, D.D., Wake Forest.
N. Y.—Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph.D., Syracuse.
Ohio—Pres. Walter H. Clippinger, Westerville.
Ont.—Rev. R. Douglas Fraser, D.D., Toronto.
Pa.—Milton G. Evans, D.D., Crozier Theological Seminary, Upland.
R. I.—Rev. Lester Bradner, Ph.D., Providence.
S. Car.—Prof. Henry N. Snyder, Litt.D., Spartanburg.
Tenn.—Prof. J. L. Cunningim, Nashville.
Tex.—R. D. Mouzon, Bishop M. E. Church South, Georgetown, Tex.
Va.—Prof. W. M. Forrest, Charlottesville.
Wash.—Pres. S. B. L. Penrose, D.D., Walla Walla.
Wis.—Pres. Edward D. Eaton, Ph.D., Beloit

Religious Education

THE JOURNAL OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Vol. VI AUGUST, 1911 No. 3

THE STANDARDIZATION OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

WILLIAM DOUGLAS MACKENZIE, LL.D.,
President Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

If we are not to talk in the air on this momentous topic, we must discuss it in presence of the actual conditons of theological education in America at present. That condition is characterized by the naturalness and freedom which are essenial features in practically all the phenomena of American social and church life. Theological education has in this country no predominating traditions, no ancient institutions whose renown and power have stood as guides to all younger institutions of the same type. If something of that kind is to be found in a few of the eastern States and in relation to three or four of the older American denominations, we must remember that by far the larger mass of the religious life of America and of its church organizations do not spring from and are not deeply influenced by these.

But I wish in this paper to emphasize one special phase of the situation. The object of theological education is to train effective ministers for all the churches of America. And we have no right as we are gathered here to limit our view to any small group of denominations. We can only as members of the Religious Education Association justify our discussion of this subject if we take a wide and open-eyed view of the facts as they concern the whole country, say, as they are presented in the religious census of the United States which has just appeared. For theological education is pursued not as if it were an end in itself but as a service of all the churches and the religious life of the whole country. Dr. Carroll has published his summary of the census statistics for 1910, from which it appears that

in this country there is a total of 35,332,776 persons of responsible years who claim allegiance to some sort of religious body. Of these 21,663,248 are classed as Evangelical; 12,711,673 as Catholic; 806,140 as non-orthodox Christian; and 151,715 as non-Christian. When we come to look at the individual denominations, we find that the total classed as Catholic includes members of the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Churches. Those classed as Evangelical comprise a very large number of denominations both of white and colored folk. They include all varieties of Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, besides the Congregationalists, United Brethren and a few others who do not share their denominational title with sister denominations. Now, of these evangelical denominations it appears that the Lutherans amount to 2,301,486 and are increasing in number more largely by immigration than by absorption from the general American people. On the other hand, the enormous increase which has taken place in the membership of the other evangelical denominations is accounted for partly by natural heredity, partly by evangelistic zeal and the continuous addition to their numbers of those who either belong to decaying denominations or to the mass of unattached persons. The largest growth among these denominations has been manifested, so far as the white people are concerned, by the Methodists and the Baptists. Among the latter the most remarkable growth is that of the Disciples of Christ, who more than doubled their membership in 20 years and now stand at 1,363,116. The Presbyterian North has increased by more than one-half. The Protestant Episcopal has increased from over 500,000 to over 900,000. The Congregational denomination has increased from over 500,000 to over 700,000.

When one comes to study these numbers in comparison with the conditions of ministerial education, the remarkable fact appears that the denominations in which theological education has attained its highest scholastic standard are not those which have increased most rapidly; and it is even questionable whether the increase which has taken place among those which have that highest standard is traceable to the influence of their most scholarly institutions. For it must be remembered that even those denominations which have what we call the strongest seminaries, scholastically considered, comprise within their ministry a large number of ordained men who have not had the advantage of attendance at those schools, but are drawn from schools of a less ambitious intellectual order, or who have been ordained on the strength of valuable practical service which has not been preceded by

any prolonged or severe intellectual discipline. When we remember that there are more than 150 seminaries in America and that the membership of the Religious Education Association would probably conclude that less than one-fourth of these have an adequate or up-to-date intellectual standard of professional education, we find our judgment of the situation still further baffled. We seem forced to ask ourselves, if we would act as in any measure leaders or authorities in theological education, what these facts mean. Can we discuss the standardization of theological education unless we have in view the actual field in which our ministers are doing their work?

It is not the purpose of this paper to investigate the facts that are before us. I wish merely to insist to-day that they demand the very close and serious consideration of every one who is concerned with the work of ministerial training. They deserve a broader and more sympathetic study than they have yet received. But they do force us to ask what we mean by standardizing this form of education. What is the standard which we would like to apply, even although we know that there is no force except that of example which can actually apply it? If it is our plan here only to describe ideals, it is still demanded of us by our common sense that our ideal be not an idle dream, but a purpose that is applicable and may be powerful in the actual circumstances of those whom it is our life-work to serve.

But the broad facts of American Church life compel one to ask, What is to be the basis of what we consider to be an ideal theological training? It is easy to vapor upon the subject, as many indeed do in a delightful, irresponsible, airy fashion, and with only partial consideration of the actual facts of the religious life of America. And charming examples of amateur dogmatism on ministerial education can be found even in past records of the Religious Education Association! For example, it might be well to ask at the outset whether, when we think of an ideal standard of theological training, our minds immediately revert to the ideal of intensified scholarship, or to the ideal of practical religious efficiency. If we refuse to say that these are to be separated, where in the country to-day do we find them actually and powerfully united? How can we prove that they are powerfully united unless we can point to the resultant work of the graduates of the most scholarly seminaries? Do these graduates account on a broad scale for the spread of the religious life, for the elevation and purifying of piety and philanthropic zeal, of missionary enthusiasm? Or if we hold that the two ideals of intensified scholarship and of practical religious efficiency are inconsistent with one an-

other, what evidence have we for that position? No one surely would say that the efficiency of the ministry is in proportion to its mere ignorance. But is it any more possible to say that anywhere it is in proportion to its mere scholarship? What, then, are the relations of these two factors in the communal religious life, and how shall we be able to describe a standard which does not include a reconciliation of what, on the surface, seems to be the contradictory spirit of these two ideals? If the aggressive and evangelistic denominations produce the more poorly educated ministry, if the best theological schools produce fewest effective pastors and evangelists, judged by numerical results (as some would maintain to be the case), then as investigators of the situation we ought to discover the root of these differences and discover some way of overcoming them so as to elicit from the present confusion something like a consistent and inspiring ideal. We cannot even discuss our standards until we have investigated the facts upon which they are to be exerted.

Of course it would be possible to maintain the position that we must distinguish between the merely numerical increase of certain denominations and the real leadership of the spiritual life of the nation. And I myself attach much importance to that obvious distinction. It might be urged that those communities where denominations prevail which have shown the largest amount of growth or are most aggressive and yet do not demand a very high type of instruction, depend indirectly upon the more cultivated communities. The less educated ministries and their churches do prove sensitive in many ways to the influence and leadership of those centers and those churches where the intellectual life is more intense. The complementary statement of this position would be that after all the preachers and pastors who exercise the widest influence over the life of the country are, as a rule, drawn from the best educated portions of the community and represent in a fine form the reconciliation of intellectual force and discipline with evangelical fervor and humane interests. I believe that this way of putting the matter undoubtedly has its truth; and yet it does not seem to me to be altogether satisfactory. It looks a little like an evasion of the real difficulty before us, and betrays its inefficiency by tempting us to a lethargic and lazy judgment of the task that we are considering. After all, it may induce us to say, let us proceed to set up our own lofty standards. But the facts are too startling, I firmly believe that they are too full of threatening possibilities for the future of religion in America, to allow of an otiose method of treatment like that.

It is obvious, I hope, that my purpose in this paper cannot be to attempt a solution of this problem, but to ask my brethren in the work of theological education, who are connected with this Association, whether the time has not come for a much more earnest and more real and more extensive dealing with the matter than we have been accustomed to, even on this platform. We are too superficial, too provincial, and too individualistic. The Evangelical denominations with more than twenty millions of members require thousands of new ministers every year. The Seminaries represented here graduate at most three or four hundred annually. I think that we must confess that none of us has yet really been brought to grapple in a powerful way with that situation, that each of us has been content to deal with a small aspect, as if it were the whole of the question of ministerial education; and we have had perhaps a somewhat arbitrary, not to say supercilious, way of assuming that the real standards are known to us because we belong to a more or less kindred group of theological schools, and that the men whose work lies beyond the circle to which we have the happiness to belong hardly know what ministerial education really is. It seems to me full time that the matter of the training of religious teachers and leaders in America should be dealt with in a manner worthy of the extent and variety and vast vital importance of that work. We ought to be considering, not the superior sections of the superior denominations, but the living needs of all the churches in all parts of America, before we can begin to consider standards that are to be practical for the whole of American Christianity.

This, then, is the situation: That the number of churches in America is growing so that whereas in 1890 there were 111,000 ministers of all churches, in 1910 there were 170,000; whereas in 1890 there were 20,000,000 communicants, in 1910 there were 35,000,000. In one year the Methodist bodies have increased 108,000, the Disciples of Christ 89,000, the Baptist bodies 85,000, the Northern Presbyterian almost 17,000, the Protestant Episcopal over 16,000. Over against that it is impossible to prove that the leading seminaries of these denominations have increased in the same proportion; and, on the other hand, it will not be suggested that the increase of membership has been produced even in the main by the graduates of what we call the most scholarly theological schools. Is it not time, therefore, that the question was asked, not by the critics but by the friends and supporters of the highest form of theological training, What is the relation between these facts? Is it not time that we cease to assume that they are due to the mere stubbornness of ignorance or to the preference of

the populace for superficial and emotional religion? Is it not time that we cease to assume that the products of the highest seminaries must trace their non-success to their personal superiority, and to the inability of the ordinary human soul to appreciate the excellence of the gifts which we are able to bestow upon them? No one will accuse me of putting this challenge to myself and my brethren in the name of obscurantism or as a plea for poor education, whether for the ministry or for any form of Christian service. It is simply in the name of sincerity, of what in our class rooms we are accustomed to denominate frank facing of the facts, that I beseech the earnest consideration of the situation that is before us.

There are three elements which enter into this situation. They are factors in the religious life of the communities which are growing so rapidly. They are factors in the life of all the seminaries in the country. I hope there is no seminary which cannot be judged in the light of at least two of these with something of approval. In the first place, there is the element of *religious fervor.* Those denominations grow, that is religion spreads and takes hold on life through those communities, in which religion is an enthusiasm, in which the absolute claims of the Gospel are felt and acknowledged, in which the authority of God over the individual soul is known to be supreme always, and at last inevitable. In the second place, those communities are characterized by what we may call in general *theological orthodoxy.* I do not mean that they all have the same documentary creed, but that they all hold to the main features of apostolic Christianity. None of them doubt that the Bible, especially the New Testament, is the supreme court of appeal regarding the nature of Christian truth, that God has proclaimed salvation through the incarnation of His Son, through the redemptive death on the Cross, through the actual victory over death, through the pouring out of His very Spirit upon the hearts of all who accept the Gospel. These bodies of Christians cannot be said to be in bondage to any one distinct creed, for as a matter of fact they have different forms of credal statement. They cannot be said to be tied up to mere verbalisms of orthodoxy, since, as we view them, the verbal expression of their faith is different in each denomination as compared with the others that are before our thought. But the convictions which I have stated are central, fundamental, in all their creeds. In the third place, there is the factor of *intellectual discipline or education.* Now it is a fact that those denominations which grow most rapidly in numbers are, as I have already said, not remarkable for their very high level of scholarship. That they number very able men

in their ministry and in the service of their institutions goes without saying. That many of these are admirable scholars need not be disputed. But on the whole their names are not known amongst those who are promoting what we should call research in the fields of theological scholarship. The books they publish are sober, able, useful, not uninfluenced by modern thought, but not distinguished for depth or minuteness of scholarly investigation. These three elements characterize the life of the churches which are growing most rapidly in our country. And no scheme of education can be practical which ignores the fact that they are there.

Now, it is when we come to consider the theological schools in relation to these three features of denominational life that our difficulties begin. Are we to assume that they are equally and permanently conditions of progress in the future as they seem to be in the present? If we put our emphasis mainly upon any one of the three, and exclude the others, are we not in danger of creating as an ideal a mere abstraction torn from the living tissues of the body in which it lives? And that is fatal. Mere enthusiasm, or mere orthodoxy, or mere scholarship is a mere poison to the Christian community. As we have seen, religious fervor, fundamental and definite loyalty to the Christian faith, and a certain measure of scholarship seem to go together. The question is, How we who are engaged in theological education are to estimate the comparative values of these three elements. If they are essential to the effectiveness of preaching it goes without saying that they must all be recognized in the life of the schools where preachers are trained. But how shall each be secured, and in what proportion shall our attention and our zeal be given to each of these factors in turn? If we are to speak of standardizing theological education, it will surely be impossible to do so by merely considering any one of these without the others. We may all admit that no one can standardize religious fervor. Who shall standardize orthodoxy? But then, what is the practical *religious* use of standardizing theological scholarship without regard to those other two factors of actual power? These are the questions which must be discussed, and they can only be discussed after some commission has considered the field not with detachment but with honesty, not in the interests of any one form of theological education but in the interests of American Christianity and the American national life.

At present I hold, then, that real and full standardization is impossible in the field of theological education, if by that we mean a standard that shall be practical for all the churches. Each man may

dream his own dream, of course; but beyond the field of his own institution or his own class room he is unable to make that dream effective. I do not yet see on the horizon any groups of theological institutions which have begun to dream the same dream, rich with all the elements and factors which I have described, having conscious agreement in the possession of a flaming and sincere religious devotion, in the possession of common doctrinal convictions, as well as in the possession of a splendid intellectual equipment. I see no hope of a highly efficient method of training the ministry being spread over America until we have, not one or two, but a number of theological institutions which have come to possess something of the same general conception of their task in relation to the Christian faith itself, to the practical work of the Gospel ministry among all orders of the people, to the ideals of scholarship which increasingly reign with power over all our minds. Standardization which is not a mere sketch on paper or an idle interchange of views among kindred spirits, can only mean the combination of a considerable number of seminaries determined to put these three factors into operation. But where shall we find that group? Who shall name them, and what magnet shall draw them together? Is it not here perhaps that even into our hearts as theological teachers something of religious fervor as well as educational idealism may enter? Perhaps it is first of all needful to pray that the passion of the advancing cause of Christ, the conquering power of the Gospel, may so take possession of the leading seminaries of the country, that in them the three fundamental factors of the Church's power shall all operate and co-operate with an intensity hitherto unknown?

Finally, let me put the matter in this way: We cannot wisely and fruitfully discuss the Standardization of Theological Education as long as we keep our eyes fixed on the title printed on our program for today.—The Standardization of Theological Seminary Curricula. That title suggests that we concentrate upon the intellectual factor of ministerial preparation. Now, we find that in the success of the ministry other factors enter which may not be set down in a program of formal studies, but are essential to the process of ministerial education. Moreover, the varieties of denominational organization, creed, ritual, and even, shall I say, of spirit do enter into and affect the program of studies; and they change the emphasis upon important topics and influence the grade of scholarship in one topic as compared with another, which is found to be practically necessary in the different denominations. Still further even within any one of the leading denominations the kind of ministerial service which is required varies

in some measure from one part of the country to another, even from one section of a city to another section of the same city. Now, what I wish to say is summed up in this, that the day has come for a thorough and exhaustive study of all these facts by the friends of theological education. Not until we have done this fairly, frankly, fearlessly and exhaustively, ought we to feel it possible to discuss the question of standardization. And I believe that there is, as yet, no organization in existence which can undertake this task unless it be this Department of the Religious Education Association under whose auspices we are met today.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN CURRENT PUBLIC EDUCATION.

BENJAMIN S. WINCHESTER, D.D.,
Educational Secretary Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society, Boston, Mass.

A recent writer has said: "Two things have been permanently settled by the American people: the children of the nation shall be educated in the public schools, and religious instruction shall not be given in those schools. There will doubtless be further discussion, but the drift of public sentiment has been so strong and steady during the last two generations that the general question can hardly be reopened."

Another writer, with equal emphasis, affirms that if we are to think of life in biologic terms, as "an adjustment to an environment," it must be the "adjustment to the total environment," and the aim of education must therefore be to secure response "to all that is in the environment." "Hence since religion has always been in the social environment, and is at the present time, education can only be complete which trains religiously." One is reminded of Herbart's dictum: The chief business of education is the ethical revelation of the *Universe.*

Others come at the matter from the practical point of view. They point to the "new demands of the modern world upon social and moral intelligence, new strains upon the will itself," and very properly raise the question whether there is a proportionate increase in the emphasis upon those things in education which will stiffen up the

will to meet these new demands. Those who feel most concerned upon this point remind us that "history has no instance of a national character built up without the aid of religious instruction, or of such character long surviving the decay of religion"; and of the further "suggestive fact that we have the only great school system the world has ever seen which does not include a definite and formal instruction in religion—with the single exception of France," which relinquished it in 1882 and has put in the place of religious instruction the most systematic and thorough moral and civic instruction ever known, "and is today working with unflagging zeal to make the moral education the most efficient and vital part of its whole curriculum."

On the other hand, it is again affirmed, "History shows that when a people has become corrupt in both its conduct and its ideals, moral teaching will not save it. . . We know now, better than we did two generations ago, that universal education is not a panacea for moral ills."

What is one to infer from this situation? Is it that so large an element is opposed to morals and religion as a part of the desirable furnishing of the human mind? On this point there is, I think, no real, or at least widespread, difference of opinion. Everyone will agree that the foundation of education must be ethical. There is very little if any question as to the responsibility of the state for providing moral instruction. But it is argued that "it is one thing to teach religion and another thing to teach morality. "Religious teaching," it is said, "is bound up with a peculiar conception of the universe, and of man's relation to that universe and to the infinite personality working in it. Moral teaching is based on social conduct, on relations between men; and morality flows naturally out of ideals of actions which we think should be realized among men."

Quite in harmony with this view is the sentiment found in the Proceedings of the National Education Association for 1903, "We must conclude, therefore, that the prerogative of religious instruction is in the church, and that it must remain in the church, and that in the nature of things it cannot be farmed out to the secular school without degenerating into a mere deism without a living Providence, or else changing the school into a parochial school and destroying the efficiency of secular instruction."

We may grant, for purposes of argument, that full and complete instruction in religion involves the matter of interpretation; an interpretation of the universe and of "man's relation to it and to the infinite personality working in it." Let it be granted also that there

is great diversity of opinion among the people of the country as to the details of these interpretations, and therefore that it is inexpedient to enter into those details in public school instruction. Grant, of course, that there is still greater diversity of opinion as to the interpretation of the Bible, of Christianity and of Christian theology; let these be eliminated, if they must be, from the list of subjects in the curriculum. Grant, again, that there is a remarkable diversity of opinion and of custom in respect to the forms of worship, that it is difficult to worship without assuming as the basis of worship certain religious ideas which are themselves of the nature of interpretations, and therefore that it is not the business of the public school to conduct worship. Grant all this, if you will; have we thereby eliminated "the religious element" from "current public education"?

Before giving a final answer to this question, it is important, in the interest of clearness, to notice one or two points which are too often ignored in this discussion. In the first place, just what do we mean by "the religious element"? When the question as to religious education is raised it is too often hastily assumed that this involves either the introduction of the Bible into the curriculum, or of formal worship, or of other formal religious teaching. Naturally, this strikes a sensitive nerve and we divide into opposing camps.

But religion is not something apart from life to be applied to it externally; it is a part of life, it is rather life itself considered in certain aspects, or with reference to certain realities. Fundamentally, religion is a spiritual comradeship; worship, in its essence, is not a formal thing to be participated in at stated times and places; it is rather the informal and unimpeded cultivation of this comradeship, it is the sharing of life between the spirit of a child, the spirit of man, and the Spirit that pervades the universe. Creeds are a part of religion, but they are only the final formulation of our ideas about the Great Comrade of our lives. Conduct is a part of religion, but conduct is religious when it is controlled by motives and directed toward ends which are in harmony with what we conceive to be the purposes of God. And no man has really learned to live until he has his life filled with enthusiasms to work together with the Working Spirit of the universe toward the attainment of the ultimate ends. The religious element in public education, therefore, comprises everything which tends to promote in the child the establishment of intimate spiritual relations with the eternal Spirit, the awakening of enthusiasms, the espousal of motives, the making of choices, from the point of view of such companionship and cooperative comradeship.

If it is asked, How shall we secure in current public education the proper recognition of the religious element, this question raises another point too often overlooked, concerning the nature of the educative process. In our so-called secular education we have come almost universally to adopt the biologic point of view. We think of the child as passing through successive stages, each of which is characterized by certain distinctive traits both physical and mental. Moreover, it is the whole child who is before us to be taught; we do not direct our effort at one time to the development of muscle and at another time to the development of mind; we do not say to ourselves, Now I will train the intellect, now the feelings, now the will. We realize, or we ought to, that there is no such artificial subdivision of the consciousness of the child.

But when we come to religion we do not yet find any such universal conception of it, or of education in it, in biological, or even in psychological terms. Too generally still is religion thought of as something apart from, outside of, the rest of our experience. Certain days are "holy" in contrast to others which, by implication, are without religious quality; certain acts are "religious," certain observances "sacred," certain institutions demand our peculiar reverence. We are suffering today from the over-objectifying of religion, from the over-identification of it with its concrete forms and institutions; when we say "religious element in education" we picture to ourselves a church, a creed or a Book. We need not less religion, but more. We need to accept for our religion what we have already accepted for the rest of our life, that man is a unit and therefore religion must pervade his entire consciousness.

We need also to accept, for religion as we have already for the rest of education, that the experiences of a child are not precisely those of the adult. Child religion is not just the same thing as adult religion. If we could really comprehend this fact much of our difficulty with the question of the religious element in public education would be at an end. For when we think of religion in connection with education we instinctively think of abstract statements about religion, and do not ask ourselves as we should, Just what is the religion of a child? This is true also of moral education as well. In that famous system of moral education inaugurated by the French it is said that the course of instruction consists largely of precepts, maxims, and explanations largely from the adult point of view and not, as should be the case, from the point of view of the child to be taught.

If then, we might agree to conceive of religion as a constant portion or aspect of our experience, and to conceive of it in every instance as it stands related to the *child's* own world and his present needs in that world, I believe that we should not find that the religious element had been eliminated from public education, even by the somewhat sweeping concessions made a moment ago; on the contrary, there would remain a very large and vital element which could be preserved both without giving offense to any considerable portion of the population and without involving in inconsistencies either the teachers in the schools, on the one hand, or the representatives of ecclesiastical bodies, on the other.

For after all, it is not religion that is objected to, so much as religiousness. All decent people desire to see a citizenship trained up that shall be reverent, loyal, upright, honest, devoted, actuated by motives of love, willing to cooperate and to endure self-sacrifice for the attainment of the right and the good, appreciative of spiritual as well as material beauty; in other words, we all want a citizenship that is simply and naturally and genuinely religious.

How, then, may the religious element be assured in public education? In the first place, there must be a teacher who is religious, in the sense in which I have used that word; reverent in spirit, one who lives in constant harmony with God's truth and laws, who finds everywhere in nature the revelation of his Spirit, who sees in history the unfolding of his purposes, who regards human life as sacred to his service, who finds in human society the present opportunity for the expression of religious faith and activity. If a teacher has not this religious element in his own life he cannot help others to possess it; if he has it, and is possessed by it, there cannot fail to be a religious element in the public education which he conducts.

It is not necessary to introduce religion as a separate subject in the curriculum. Religion is not a subject, it is an attitude, a spiritual relationship. The religious teacher will take hold of the awakening instincts and direct them toward God. Jesus and Socrates did not teach subjects; they inspired and awakened men's souls. He will not omit to give the child, in the early years of primary or kindergarten instruction, the satisfaction of thinking of this wonderful world as God's world, and of God as exercising a loving and protecting care. The laws of life, the great physical laws which underlie this material universe, will not be taught as mere impersonal abstractions, but as the orderly methods by which the divine Mind works. Obedience is cooperation. Forces, also, are the expression of that same Mind and

Power. As the years of adolescence approach, and the minds of young people reach out instinctively for the larger world, why may not they be led to think of that larger world as centering in the infinite personality who made it and guides it? Why leave them to grope in a hopeless vacuity? Why not emphasize, instead of ignore, the religious element in the great men throughout history? It is seldom that the emphasis upon this quality would not illumine such a life, for, whatever the form of religion held, history presents to us few characters worthy of our emulation who have been wholly without religion. And when there arises the question of social relationships, of vocation, of personal ideals, where is there any basis for altruism and service, for anything indeed but crass materialism and selfishness, except in the thought of loyalty to a great cause, and back of that, the loyalty to the great Cause?

How shall such things be taught? Not as subjects. Not necessarily as precepts. Not as dogmas. Not in any way formally. But incidentally, as occasions arise in connection with almost every subject in the curriculum, by example, through the participation of the life of the teacher in that of the pupil; here, as on the threshold of every other great and vital element in education, the teacher stands at the door, holding it open and inviting to enter. Is this so vague as to be not worth while? Believe me, it is the most real and effective kind of religious teaching. It is real, because it is related to real things, it comes in as an integral part of life and consciousness and not something extraneous thereto. It is effective, because the pupil feels that it is not introduced perfunctorily, but expresses the actual convictions of the teacher whom he trusts and admires.

In conclusion, may I say that not only must we recognize that there is properly this religious element in public education which cannot be evaded or ignored. It is time that we acknowledged the responsibility frankly and undertook to plan for its universal and systematic and scientific introduction into the system of public education. For what is the inference which young people draw from the present hesitating, or repudiating, situation? I once asked a boy of fourteen what he thought of Sunday school, as compared with day school. It was a Sunday school, by the way, which had been making a serious and honest effort to apply every valuable recent discovery in child study and pedagogy in its work of religious education. It had a complete curriculum of study, it had a new and convenient building with separate classrooms, it had attractive courses of study and well-trained teachers. This boy confessed that everything had been

done to make things interesting, yet he did not have the same feeling of response toward the Sunday school that he did toward the day school. Why? This was the answer: "You have to know the things that are taught in the day school or you can't succeed in life; but the things taught in Sunday school are not important!" I submit that this is the inevitable conclusion to which any thoughtful boy is driven by the conditions which exist at present. The ignoring of religion in public education today, or the discussion as to whether it may be admitted in education, is itself positive teaching to young people that religion is not essential to life. Do we wish to teach them this?

During the last few years there has been a great quickening of interest in education which is distinctively religious. The different denominations and churches of the country are accepting responsibility for their share in this task, and are addressing themselves to this work with an energy, an enthusiasm and an intelligence hitherto unparalleled. I do not think that the churches wish to evade a particle of their proper responsibility. Nor do I think that any of them would be in favor of unloading this task upon the public school. But with all this increase of enthusiasm for religious education on the part of the churches it is becoming increasingly evident that they cannot do this alone. Church and school must cooperate. We must get together, and patiently sit down to discover what part of religious education belongs to each. The church must build upon the results of public school teaching; and the school, in turn, must build upon the work of the church. The two institutions are not antagonistic but cooperative and supplementary. The public school may not be able to do some things which are a legitimate part of religious education, but it can do, and it ought to do, a very vital part; let us frankly acknowledge and appreciate its part.

CONVERSION AND MORAL INSTRUCTION.

THE SOCIAL FUNCTION IN CONVERSION, AND ITS RELATION TO SECULAR MORAL INSTRUCTION.

FREDERIC M. GILES,
Principal Township High School, DeKalb, Ill.

Under the changed conditions of modern life the established methods of moral instruction are failing to a noticeable degree to pass on standards of moral ideals to the oncoming citizens. Since, for the good of society, this moral inheritance should be the possession of every individual, new methods must be devised, or old methods adapted, to accomplish this transmission of ideals. The question is how shall we start on this problem of method? The writer believes that the elements of such a method may be gathered from a consideration of the function of religion in the life of the individual and in society. Let us consider these two aspects of religion.

For the individual, interest in religion is not merely a question of emotion wrongfully directed, which increased enlightenment will discard. This religious attitude arises in response to a need of the individual in the face of an acute problem in his life. The religious attitude is the natural reaching out of the maturing personality for the meaning of the universe and the individual's relation to it. It is the attempt to settle the ultimate problem of life toward which all the individual's experience has been leading and which now, in adolescence he is forced to answer. Even as the youth has adjusted himself to the meaning of the family, society, and the state so now he must adjust his life to the problem of the world as a whole; and he asks himself such questions as: Why was I born? What is the justice of my position in life? What is death? What is this great universe? As in the course of history most answers to these questions have been bound up with religion, it is but natural that most individuals should find through religious conversion their answers to the questions.

But religious conversion is only the positive aspect of conversion. Is not the decision "no" against a religious conviction just as much a decision as "yes." If the individual makes his answer with a religious solution we say that he has been converted. But has he any less been "converted" when he accepts as his decision an indifferent, selfish, pleasure-loving ideal? Indeed may we not say that the decision in-

volved in conversion or against it as it is a decision on the meaning of life is met and answered religiously or otherwise by everyone. Further this decision as to the meaning of the universe is made by most people in adolescence and thereafter becomes a fixed element in the life of the individual. The point for our discussion is this: as practically all individuals make the decision in adolescence must not the moral elements in the community see to it that their case is presented to practically all citizens strongly in adolescence so that they may see the real moral elements in the world and make their decisions for a moral organization of their life. This is the need for general moral instruction. What means have we for doing this?

The problem of any social group, religious or otherwise, is to transmit without loss to each maturing generation the moral values that have been worked out by preceding generations. For some time the church has been the means for accomplishing this civic duty; because the church is the great social institution wherein are conserved not only the religious, but also the moral and ethical values, such as industry, honesty, kindliness, etc., which have been achieved by mankind in its effort to define the meaning of life. So conversion has been the great means whereby these values have been introduced into the life of the adolescent at a time when, seeking to define his social attitude, he is plastic to their reception.

It must be evident also that if the church through conversion fails to accomplish this moral task that the state or some civic body, must undertake the work. For it is of the highest importance to society that in the attitude-forming period of adolescence some means of organizing social values, giving them the stamp of social approval and introducing them into the life of the individual be regularly performed in the state. Such means were an essential part of the community life of primitive and classical peoples, and such institutions were undoubtedly originated in response to a felt civic need.

On the other hand when this social training is omitted, the community leaves the individual to get no profit from the accumulated moral experience of the race, but slowly and often at cross purposes with society, to work out his own values: for instance, possibly to assume attitudes detrimental to his fellows, and to find through bitter experience the unsatisfactory character of them; or, possibly, when the individual is strong and rapacious, for the state to find out its loss in having trained ungrateful and individualistic citizens who selfishly seek success at the cost of social suffering.

Thus where religious training is lacking, or even in addition to it for the sake of social unanimity, some ethical and moral training strengthened by the social approval of the state or nation should undoubtedly be given. Unfortunately the tendency today is, having lost interest and faith in the theological aspect of religion, to lose faith in the moral values which have been bound up with it; or at least to fail to appreciate the social need for an institution which will give to the adolescent at this most favorable time such an environment, instruction, and social duties as will lead him to realize his obligation to society, and the need to make moral principles a part of his life.

Just at present we seem to be at sea as to the means for giving this moral inheritance; the churches do not reach the masses of our young people, and their teaching in some quarters is discredited because of other-worldly elements; the school, the other great institution which might do this, has not yet adapted itself either in aims or processes to the task, and indeed its fitness for the task may be questioned; for the institution to accomplish such work successfully should be vitally in touch with practical affairs, if not a part of them, and its directors looked up to by youth because of their practical achievements. As teachers in general lack the social prestige and esteem, if indeed they are not somewhat discredited, as compared with doctors, lawyers, and successful business men, it is to be questioned whether they can inculcate morals that the youth will voluntarily accept. For such instruction to be effective must have back of it the approval and the active endorsement of the accepted successful men in the community. The question is: Can we devise such a means, or modify our present social institutions to meet the need?

As examples of this social orientation and the impression of moral values on the adolescent, which had back of them the entire social unit, we have the ceremonies and pledges in connection with the attaining of manhood among classical nations. The youth was denied certain privileges until after the civic ceremony and then only after expressing his devotion to the state, and to the gods, was he allowed to join the ranks of privileged adults. The effect on the youth of denying desired privileges until after the initiation ceremonies, and of emphasizing social ties at the impressionable period of life must have brought about in the individual a consciousness of his vital relation to others, his dependence on the state and his need for social devotion. It must have done much to do away with what has been called to-day our "state blindness." It is possible that leaders and teachers of youth may get a suggestion of how to inculcate social values apart

from sectarian religious teachings, which seems to be the great difficulty now, from a study of these institutions. Of course the problem was much easier in Greece, where religion and life were so intimately connected, than it is today.

In the civic ceremonies in Athens there was first an examination of the youth's physical fitness, in which he appeared stripped before his examiners. This must in itself have set a standard for physical excellence and personal morals. The candidate was then presented with arms in the presence of the people, and at the sanctuary of a divinity who had sacrificed her life for the state, he took the following oath. Its military character might be objected to today, but in it nevertheless are some high social virtues. "I promise never to dishonor these arms; never to save my life by a shameful flight, and I will fight while breath lasts for the preservation of religion and the state with the other citizens, but alone if need be. I will never put my country in a condition less honored than that in which I have found her; on the contrary, I will devote all my efforts to rendering her more flourishing. I will obey the magistrates and the laws and all those who shall rule by the will of the people. If anyone violates, or tries to destroy the law, I will not conceal such an attempt, but will oppose it either alone, or with the help of my fellow citizens. Finally, I will remain absolutely devoted to the religion of my fathers. I call upon Agraulos, Eulalios, Mars, and Jupiter as witnesses of my oath."

So also savage and barbarous peoples have similar institutions emphasizing the youth's and maiden's relation to the social unit, and laying stress on qualifications and duties that the community feels are worth while. As, for instance, in the initiation of boys among the Bechuanas, the initiate in reply to such questions as: Will you guard the cattle well? Will you guard the chief well? replies, "I will." And in the initiation of girls among the natives of the Caroline Islands, the maidens learn to prepare foods and to make garments before being admitted to the ranks of mature women. Again among some peoples the boy must show his ability to aid the state as a warrior and, as evidence, must bring in the head of an enemy he has killed. And in nearly all cases the importance of these adolescent initiatory ceremonies among barbarous peoples is enhanced by secrecy, solemnity, and pain. The question is: Did not these savage and classical initiations perform a real function for society, a function which must be performed in any society: the giving of social solidarity to its new members? And is not the state today losing solidarity because it has no means for passing on to adolescents a knowledge of,

and a regard for the essentials of morality, both civic and personal, which should be the possession of all citizens regardless of religious creed or lack of creed? The problem is, how is the state today to make its prospective citizens realize the great social need which lies back of the fundamental moral laws?

To answer this question we must consider: who is to set the fundamental moral law? And, further, what force induces the individual to accept a moral standard? How, in other words, he arrives at his moral standard? These questions are pretty definitely answered by the facts of comparative morality. A group through its acknowledged leaders sets a standard, and by social pressure enforces on the members of the group conformity to these standards. We may say then in its dynamic aspect morality is a group matter, and not an individual matter, save as the individual represents a group. It follows then, that since morality is based on group power that the passing on of standards to each maturing generation is one that must be handled by group means for the group alone is competent to handle it. Our neglect of this element in moral instruction accounts in large measure for the lack of results in our moral teaching. For community influence is the real force which lies back of any moral standard, and only when it sustains moral teaching can the teaching be effective.

Moreover this group influence is particularly powerful with the individual at the formative period for morals, adolescence; and we may say that the character of the morals of the maturing individual is largely determined by the character of the group which gets control of him at this time. In general he is influenced by two groups: the group composed of those of his own age, and the group composed of mature individuals, adult society. The adolescent group unimpregnated by adult ideals tends to fall away from society's standards. It is the task of the adult group to correct this tendency through the impression on the adolescent group of those ideals which have been found necessary to a livable state. In the past social groups were organized to transmit such ideals; today, we as adult groups are careless of our responsibility for this and, as a result, the standard of adolescent groups is deteriorating. And it would seem that no program for moral instruction will be effective in correcting this tendency unless it recognizes the need of having group influence supporting its teachings.

More specifically the situation today is as follows: On the one hand we have the adolescent group to which the youth belongs by inclination, boisterous, heady, going to extremes, and often driven by

passion to excesses. On the other hand the adult group which the youth must eventually join bringing these unruly ideals, is careless of its moral problem, and makes almost no effort to impress desirable social qualities on its prospective members. Thus the adolescent makes many mistakes, as much through ignorance as through malice, and learns only after much loss of time and the waste so to speak of much moral capital.

The problem of moral instruction for youth, in its practical aspect involves the problem of bringing adult group influence to bear on the adolescent group. Individuals alone cannot solve the problem. One home alone cannot solve the problem. The individual well taught in the home, on coming into a group outside where ideals are scorned or ridiculed, finds himself doubting his early teaching, and in most cases, accepting the group standard. On the other hand, the individual teacher standing alone for a principle, finds himself ineffective until he can rally group support to his cause. To teach the youth effectively, the community, if possible, or some portion of it in which the youth has confidence, because he looks up to their achievements, must unite on the essentials of moral instruction. These essentials to be accepted must exclude sectarian or religious instruction, and include such teaching as may be shown to have a bearing on civic life. The elements so selected must be passed on to the youth by a means which has back of it social forces and the stamp of social approval. The practical question is: How shall we make a start? One that is not so radical as to be disruptive, but one that will be the outgrowth of present conditions.

In high school it is possible that a start in this direction could be made by having the parents' associations unite on these essentials of moral teaching which they would support in school and enforce at home. By this social backing the moral instruction would cease to be considered as an individual peculiarity of the teacher, and so be held inconsequential. It would, instead, become a social fact to be honestly respected, and in so far as it was based on fundamental moral law it would be observed. Thus the power of the teaching would be increased many fold.

If, in addition to the help of parents, the school could get, not alone the ethical teachers, but the leaders in the active work of the world, to state what they consider the fundamentals of morals; what they follow in their business, and expect of their employees, and if these moral facts were brought to bear on youth, teachers could make still more powerful moral teaching. The virtues of obedience, indus-

try, purity, the dignity of the social law, and the need for social effort could certainly be made much more evident than today, when individuals unaided attempt to make their value plain.

Further by such socal backing the school becomes more closely knit to the community and so becomes a more vital and effective social institution. Thus the result would be to increase the power of the school in all its work of bringing the young to the desired social standard. This would be brought about by the increased respect given the teacher as the representative of manifest social forces, and of the increased respect felt for the school because it controlled acknowledged social forces.

For boys, at any rate, there is a physical element in moral instruction which must not be overlooked. On this side, if there was at given intervals a physical examination of adolescent boys, and if reports were made and rewards given for physical excellence, surely a standard for bodily well being would be set. And at the same time the shedding of light on bodily conditions would act as a check on certain forms of social dissipation, which now are treated almost with indifference, even though we perceive the vicious effects on the individual, the family, and the state. Thus would a strong, social force be added to the side of social purity.

It might be in the future, as the need for civic instruction became felt in the community, that the leaders in the community in all ranks of life, could lend the inspiration of their presence and acknowledgment of their belief in social morality to a civic festival held, say once a year in school, in which the civic virtues could be extolled and emphasized, and a definite civic program followed. This latter to include the pledging of the adolescent to the state not only in general but also in particular to the performing of specific civic duties that might be deemed advisable. The purpose of the latter to be to impress on the individual the notion of civic responsibility. Then there might be the awarding of privileges for civic excellence to those who had served the state well during the past year. The idea of the privilege being to enhance through recognition the value of civic virtue. The function should be given an emotional tone, so necessary to an occasion of this sort, by appropriate music and ceremonies. Perhaps a definite instruction in duties, civic and personal, to those attaining a certain age might be given as a preliminary to the festival. And in this part, of the function civic righteousness could be considered in detail. At the end of the ceremonies an awarding of civic rights might take place. Thus it could take its place as a real social function.

As far as the whole community expressed itself in such meetings, the gatherings would be successful in emphasizing moral values and in creating an enthusiasm for morals. As they became true civic festivals and included not alone the school but also the entire community, they would create enthusiasm for morals, and thus regenerate moral teaching and give a great force which could be used in moral enterprises. And even in the beginning they would serve to call the attention of all the community to the civic mother, who is greater and more important than any one of us, and in whose life each is vitally interested. Further, each community, no matter how small or large, having adolescents in school, could have such a civic festival. Surely if we can hold a festival for our great men, we ought to do it for the State who is greater than the greatest of her citizens. Yet by recognizing her greatness we shall have greater citizens.

The above plan may seem fanciful to some, but the writer believes some plan to bring community pressure to bear on moral instruction of adolescents must be found, if morals are to be successfully taught. And this specific plan is offered not as a solution, but as a starting point for thought and discussion.

Moreover it becomes evident as moral standard in the formative period is so largely a question of group influence that, that portion of the community which believes in moral values and moral instruction must unite in order to make its influence felt, if indeed it must not unite for its own preservation. Without such concerted action the degenerating influences of the community have unimpeded sway, and tend rapidly to sweep away the moral accumulation of society. And only by such union can these influences be offset.

On the other hand when we criticise the prevailing low standard of youthful morals and lay the blame on the public school, we must remember that it is idle to expect the school to teach the adolescent to accept a higher standard of morals than that which passes in the groups of which he is a member, and, in general, in society at large. The constant effect of the community influence is to break down the teachings that are put forth in the school and the result of the teaching is almost nil. It behooves the adult community then to clean its skirts, and before it starts on a moral campaign to live up to the standard that it wishes the youth taught.

We see, in conclusion, that the church has been doing a civic work in conversion. But as increased religious diversity, and religous doubt makes it almost impossible for the church to continue to do this successfully, it becomes necessary for the state to perform the work in

order to conserve its moral foundation Secondly, this work can only be done by individuals who have back of them social forces, since moral standards are social units. The question practically involves the conscious coming together of adult social units in order to use their power as a group in influencing adolescents to adopt desirable social ideals. At present we are witnessing the lethargy of adult social units, and the running amuck, so to speak, of adolescent groups; with the consequent impression on adolescents of turbulent and individualistic social ideals. It would seem, however, that with intelligent leadership and instruction in the high school and elsewhere, where adolescents come together, supported by wise and forceful backing from the community at large, conscious that such backing is necessary for real moral training, that a much higher standard of social morality might be passed on to oncoming citizens.

JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

THE TRAINING OF JEWISH TEACHERS OF RELIGION.

RABBI LOUIS GROSSMAN, D.D.,
Principal of the Teachers' Institute and Professor of Pedagogy and Ethics in the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Teachers' Institute of the Hebrew Union College is a little more than two years old. It owes its establishment to the generosity and forethought of Jacob H. Schiff and is organized for the purpose of training teachers for Jewish religious schools. For more than fifty years the Jewish congregations throughout the country have been operating Sunday and other schools for the instruction of Jewish youth, but the administration is insufficient, the methods of class-instruction vary in as many ways as there are separate schools, and most of the teachers in dilletantes whose main merit is their good intention. This condition is intolerable and full of danger. Aside from the mischief which must inevitably come from disorder, and amateurism, modern Judaism is face to face with one of the most serious problems it has yet been called upon to solve. At no previous period has a generation of Jews been so dependent for its religious culture upon mere school-work. Jewish tradition is no longer a distinct current; it fuses with other cultural influences, and the distinctive Jewish character is fighting for life. Modern Jews must reenforce

their spiritual tradition by an effective religious pedagogy. Upon the teacher and the school devolves the obligation to secure the continuity of the Jewish spirit. It is with us not a reformation of methods only, but an issue upon the right diposition of which hangs our future. In our case, the project of an effective training in religion and morals is not one of expediency to tide us across a difficulty, but of the very heart and genius of Judaism and of the Jewish people. It was this consideration that suggested prompt action to meet the emergency.

The Jews are arranging for formal instruction in specific, religious and moral principles because they live in an environment which does not conduce to an intense and encompassing domesticity. The Jewish people must meet the new condition. But we are not willing to give up the ideal nor to shift the centre of our moral genius, for we Jews have cultivated it under more trying circumstances and at some pains. We will continue to do what our fathers have done, to make the home the moral centre of child-life and to rivet its soul there, so that the moral influence may continue as a binding force between old and young, between parent and child, between the ancestral and the new. And we shall add to these silent factors whatever confirming strength may come from systematic school-effort. The Sunday school is not an indigenous institution among the Jews, and it has become merely naturalized among us, but we will raise it to the most effective efficiency. Only we will not be content with a religious school which limits itself to formal instruction and edification. We want to construct the religious life of the child and the Sunday school must fit in with the Jewish life and its aspirations. The confidence which the Christian denominations have in the Sunday schools in the face of the disconcerting agencies which are active all around modern childhood, the all too confident expectation that the Church will stand secure on the one leg of a school-hour once a week, we Jews do not share. We know that faith has a right to more and we can prove that by centuries of history and clouds of witnesses, not only of martyrs and heroes, but of the people of those who grappled with the serious difficulties of experience and sought the comfort and the reenforcement of religion. The Jewish people is loyal to its own, not because it has academic reasons that Judaism is true and so on, but because its Judaism has become its flesh and blood. It is possible for a Baptist to teach general Christianity, it is possible for a Presbyterian to teach in a Baptist church, but it is not possible for a Christian to teach Judaism to Jews. Only a Jew can teach Jews their faith. Not even the most de-Christianized can satisfy a Jew. It is not the mere know-

ing Judaism that equips either the teacher or the confessor of Judaism. The school that aims at mere telling about Judaism has no vital bearing upon the Jewish life. We want to avoid the defect which the modern Christian Sunday religious school has to be merely academic and aloof from life. The Sunday school is attached to the Church; it does not grow out of it. The reverse is the historic fact in the Jewish schools. They grew out of the life of the Jewish people. In fact, they were the life of the people. Jews call their houses of worship schools ("schul'") still today, and through the Middle Ages the Charters and Bills of Toleration designate Jewish places of worship as Jewish academies. The most solemn part of the ritual in the Synagogue is the reading of the scriptures and laymen are called to the reader's desk with the elaborate announcement of their academic degrees. The sermon, which recent Judaism has incorporated into the service, was originally an academic exercise and it was the ambition of every one to be able to take part in it. One who could not do so stood lower on the social scale of the Jewish community, and there was no disgrace more feared than to be accorded the honor of being called to the reading of the law and proving oneself incompetent.

To be sure there was no "method" in all of this. But neither has life a "method" and the soul is not built up in the other essential instincts by "method." It was not a rise in value when we laid the measure of the school-room on religiousness and it was not an advance in religious culture when we began to treat it as an accomplishment like other polite accomplishments. The traditional manner of handing down religiousness from father to son, and of making it, as the heart in the body, the heart, as it were, of all domestic and social interests, is personal and direct and it is this directness and this immediateness and intinctiveness which we aim for in our modern pedagogy. Modern pedagogy consults the processes of natural life. Method is the logic of nature and not the logic of a philosophic system. It may not be easy to say just what constitutes a right religious pedagogy, but we can demand this: that it give what nature demands. Jewish educational ideals may be regarded as altogether modern in this reliance upon natural instincts. Jews foster a religion of law in human affairs. They scent law, method, the organizing force in everything. Jewish education, accordingly, does not build upon mere expediencies but is grounded upon natural life. The Jewish teacher feels that he is an organ of historic tradition and he stands in front of his class not as an instructor, but as the representative of fathers, of fathers of fathers, of sons of sons, of unseen ancestors and of unseen descendants.

It is thus obvious that the introduction of Sunday schools among Jewish communities was no reform. Rather I might call "reform" a lapse from self-developing genius. Necessity forced it upon modern Judaism, the conditions without rather than conditions within. Through historic facts beyond its control, in the first centuries of the Jewish dispersion, the Jews preserved their faith and themselves by strict conservatism. Historic facts, in the more recent centuries, superinduced a laxness in practice and in feelings. The Jewish people has alternated between two extremes, of loyalty to orthodoxy and of loyalty to universalism, and the middle point between these was not infrequently the dead point. If the special religious school has any meaning at all amongst us today, when all education, in its essence, is religious and moral, it is as a device to overcome this dead point, which is a point both of danger and of promise. We must counteract the disintegrating influences of modern, promiscuous life, and we must come to the rescue of the Jew and the Jewish community, which by its impulsive Judaism has always been prone to go after new idols. To prevent the damage to the tested facts of Jewish life we must meet the subtle attacks on the vitals of Jewish faith and fidelity. And so the Jewish religious school has a mission and answers a need. In order to meet that need rightly, however, religious education must be constructive. The Jew believes that education makes religion and he believes also that religion, or rather religiousness, pervades all true teaching, that the culture-content of all instruction is religion. Especially does the Jew believe this of the American public school and it is on that account that he is so loyal to it. Believing in the sufficiency of the secular school, even from the point of view of his religion, the Sunday school seems to the Jew subordinate, if not a duplication of effort. But every religion, as a historic fact and as a historic movement, has important things to say with regard to experience and with regard to character. The story of Jewish experience, the account how moral stamina helped a people to prevail, constitutes in itself an effective curriculum. And if this story is told not as sentimental gush, but with circumspection and adjustment to healthy and growing youth, there is ample good to come from the Jewish Sunday school. The Sunday school may do the kind of work which the public school, being neutral, may never attempt to do, to transmit to childhood the religious earnestness and exaltation which are necessary elements in life. For such a purpose, however, the Sabbath school must give more than mere homilies and emotional "talks." The Jewish people will tolerate as a measure of influence only the virile suggestions that come from

real life. There is a call, therefore, upon the teacher of Judaism to take the subject-matter of instruction out of the heart of real life. The curriculum of a Jewish Sabbath school must contain facts which are representative of the life the children are dealing with and must learn to adjust themselves to. It will not do to teach abstract principles. Life must tell in the school-room, the historic life of the Jewish people must revive, as it were, among the Jewish children. In the school, Abraham is not a preacher of the unity of God, Moses is not a prophet whose mission is fulfilled when he leads the people to the foot of Mt. Sinai, and Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel are not prophets who foretell a coming glory, but they are types of life. The discerning teacher will employ Jewish history, literature, thought and aspiration for the culture of the boy and the girl.

It is considerations such as these which are at the basis of our work at the Teachers' Institute. We are preparing teachers for Jewish religious schools and are bringing to bear upon our work all that modern psychology, pedagogy, modern religious psychology and religious pedagogy offer.

We are working out a great problem, the significance of which may go beyond the limits of our Jewish concerns. For, if the sects are divided on theology, they cannot be safely nor long divided on the subject of pedagogy. Our experiment in religious education is an experiment in which general questions of religious pedagogy are involved, and may be of consequence to all denominations alike. Not only must the courses in all Sunday schools be re-organized but the very principle of re-organization must be agreed on. As in psychology, there can be but one scientific standard, as in religious psychology there can be but one kind of truth, the truth that comes to us from the laboratory of the living facts of human mind and human feeling and human will, so in pedagogy, and in the specific field of religious pedagogy, we stand, all of us, on strictly scientific, on reconciling and common ground. The course of study in all religious schools is to be determined not by the separatist interests of denominationalism, but by the undeniable and the inevasible claims of life. The Teachers' Institute will work out, it is hoped, a valid and working form of instruction in religion and morals, made possible for us today by the progress of science. It will give to the graduate a wholesome sense of respect for and confidence in the laws of child-growth, in the function religion has in the economy of soul-life. The Jew has an exceptional advantage from the fact that, having been in the very throes

of history, he can feel better than any other what a drill it is for the souls of men.

The Teachers' Institute regards it as a fundamental principle that the work of the Sunday school should run parallel with the work of the public school, that the two should supplement each other and that, above all, they should have a common term in scientific pedagogy, with the eye equally upon child-life and child-growth and that they should assist each other by making the educational life a unit. No Sunday school should so teach as to disconcert the child and tear it into a direction other than that of the public school. A fundamental condition of right religious development is that all the agencies that are busy to help the child-development should agree. It is the diversity of influences and their lack of unanimity that have caused mischief, and the Sunday school must contribute not to the confusion of the child, but rather to its clarity.

In the Teachers' Institute, the model lessons, which we give, aim not merely to make the candidates for teaching more expert in the technique of teaching, but also to train them into observation, so that they, in turn, may enrich the science through their observations. We spread the field of interest, and we hope to make Sunday school teachers eager not only to do their duty, but also to be interested in the cause, as students who feel that they may teach only to the degree in which they can themselves learn. In a certain sense, all teaching is experimentation, for who knows what he brings forth!

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SUNDAY SCHOOL.

POSSIBILITIES THROUGH ITS CURRICULUM.

REV. E. MORRIS FERGUSSON, Philadelphia,
Educational Secretary, S. S. Board Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

The facts of the field require a somewhat broad construction of our topic. The typical Sunday school of this class has no "aims" that professional educators would recognize as such. To keep the school from disbanding for lack of a superintendent; to keep it open twelve months in the year; to raise money enough to pay for the quarterlies and a few extra hymn books, with two or three missionary collections in the course of the year; to make every session bright and interesting; at Christmas, Easter and Children's Day to give an enter-

tainment that the neighborhood will consider a success; and at least once every two or three years to have a revival of religion,—these are the characteristic aims of the little neighborhood Sunday school. The idea that the enterprise is a school and is at work upon the character and spiritual equipment of each pupil is seldom formulated in the Sunday school's conscious thinking. We must remember, also, that even the rudimentary aims I have tried to formulate are seldom fully attained; the school as like as not meets only for six months in the year; one dollar is a sum which it may take several Sundays' collections to amass; the superintendent may be a young girl who is trying to hold the school together till they can find a man who can lead in prayer; or, what is much more discouraging, the superintendent may be a hard-headed old farmer who magnifies his office and stands foursquare in the path of every possible educational reform. While, therefore, this Sunday school's aims must at all times be sympathetically appreciated and cooperated with, it is our aims for the little school, rather than the little school's own aims, with which we have to do. Moreover, this little school is an organism so simple in structure, that it is not possible to study the problem of its curriculum without frequent reference to the other topics of this symposium.

From what I know of these little Sunday schools, I am convinced that every one of them, even the smallest and weakest, ought to have, can have, and some day will have, a curriculum or course of graded Sunday school lesson study. There is an excellent chance of installing such a course in a large proportion of them, say thirty per cent, within the next ten years. No plan of study that is not graded can be educationally right; for unless it is graded it will not fit the children. Now the idea that there is any necessary connection between the simplicity of the little Sunday school and the simplicity of the uniform lesson, is born of confused thinking as to what constitutes simplicity; and to hold and teach such an idea bespeaks lack of faith in the principles of the new education. No cause more serious or fundamental than inertia, low educational ideals and the lack hitherto of available lesson material, has kept the principle of gradation from being quite as characteristic of the little Sunday school as is now the principle of lesson uniformity. The graded little school, spontaneous, indigenous and all but universal, is a perfectly thinkable possibility.

The problem presented to us by this idea of a curriculum for the little school is partly academic: for unless the course is pedagogically sound, the introduction of it would be but a barren triumph. But a solution that is only academic is no solution at all. After we have

formulated, tested and officially approved our ideal curriculum, we have but stepped upon the threshold of our real task, which is to get the curriculum adopted by the fifty or seventy-five thousand little Sunday schools of North America. What we may call the political side of our problem is so very much more important that we would be foolish not to give it, our principal attention. We must however first have a practical working plan of good graded lessons for the little Sunday school before it will be in order to consider how the plan is to be pushed. And before we can consider ourselves qualified to draft such a plan, we must inquire into the little Sunday school's present educational condition,—its customs, attainments and ideals, its ordinary tools and methods of using them, its prevailing structure and teaching force.

Taking the country at large, it is a safe generalization to say that the little Sunday school studies its lessons from lesson leaves or quarterlies on the International uniform lesson; and it generally buys the cheapest variety of these that the market affords. Sometimes, but not often, the lesson leaves and quarterlies are supplemented by a reasonably adequate supply of Bibles, partly owned by the school and partly brought by pupils and teachers. The method employed with these helps is either catechetical or homiletic; the pupils learn and recite golden texts and other verses, find and read answers to questions, and occasionally prepare themselves by preliminary study to answer questions in recitation; while both teachers and superintendent are wont to make this study, or so much of it as they can secure, the basis for conversations and talks directed almost entirely to the end of present moral improvement and spiritual appeal, with occasional honest efforts to elucidate geographical and historical points, or to make the lesson narrative vivid and applicable.

The lesson material, being common, furnishes an effective basis for unity of impression; of which circumstance the superintendent, in the better class of little schools, makes good use through his prayer, his musical selections, his responsive reading of the lesson text and his closing review and appeal. The teachers, also, guided by their instinctive perception of the pupils' needs, and frequently actuated by zeal and devotion, are constantly seeking to make good use of the opportunities which by this system are from time to time presented, as the lesson selections move in a six-year cycle through the matchless pedagogical material of the Bible. Meantime, the steady, monotonous and therefore educationally effective routine of the little school is making its impression upon the habits of the children; the social unity

and friendliness of the weekly Sunday school gathering creates an atmosphere favorable to the development of character; the unconscious tuition of music, devotion and personality performs its steady service; the schoolhouse environment, with blackboard, desk, maps and dictionary contributes its share to the educational seriousness of the session of the schoolhouse Sunday school; and so, little by little, that important section of our American people whose Sunday experiences center round the little neighborhood Sunday school is prepared for that commanding place which it has always taken in the life of church and nation.

Our appreciation, however, of the dignity and potency of these educational forces must not for an instant blind us to the woeful inadequacy of such a program. The six-years' uniform series of Bible selections, which the Lesson Committee furnishes and the lesson publishers issue has its incidental advantages as supplied to such a school; but these are completely overbalanced by the fact that such selections constitute at the best only the raw material of adapted educational effort; and even when intelligently interpreted in the best of our lesson quarterlies and papers, they demand for their effective presentation an amount of adaptive skill which is far beyond the powers of any but the exceptional teacher in the little school.

To this statement of the general situation some additions must be made. Here and there, especially in New England, some pastor, school teacher or other local worker has succeeded in introducing into the little school the Bible Study Union lessons or some other attempt at a consciously graded system of lesson material. The supplemental lessons for elementary grades, the first three courses of the International graded lessons and teacher-training lessons have introduced in many little schools a course of studies which might be considered as a partial curriculum.

Look for a moment at the personal structure of such a school. There are not many children of Beginners' age: it is too hard to get them to and from the schoolhouse. One teacher is in charge of the Primary class, which may embrace children up to nine or ten years of age, sometimes up to twelve or fourteen. There is a class of boys ranging from nine to fifteen or so, a corresponding class of girls, and the unorganized adult class; in which it is not unusual to find, for personal reasons, various members who ought properly to be with the juniors or even in the primary class. The introduction of the cradle roll idea tends to bring out more of the beginners, and opens the way for a beginners' or kindergarten class below the primary; whilst the

increasing emphasis on teacher-training may result in the forming of a senior class of teacher-training pupils. All our plans, however, must allow for the loosely graded class,—the class containing children of at least three or four different yearly grades; and our plan of graded lesson courses must reckon with the corresponding fact that there are only three, four or five teachers to cover all the graded ages, and that, consequently, not more than this number of separate courses can possibly be taught at one time.

On the other hand, the teachers in this school have had their native wits sharpened by the need of meeting and solving these very difficulties; the limited number of children in the community and the intimate knowledge which every one has of everybody else has made it possible to individualize far beyond the ordinary limits of a city worker; the day-school tasks of the pupils are much less than in the city; and the personal needs and capacities of each pupil are just as real when there is only one of him, as when there are a dozen or forty, organized into a grade, and provided with every modern textbook and applicance and a corps of teachers. The pupil, moreover, who is ten years old today, will just as assuredly be eleven years old a year hence in the little school as in the big one; and experience shows that the moment this consideration is fairly presented to the country teacher and actualized in a workable graded proposition, he reacts to it and begins to shape his work into graded fashion. For the little school, therefore, we need a course of study that is graded quite as closely as is demanded by the most carefully graded city school; for every possible graded subdivision is likely to be represented in the little school by some one or more pupils who need just that material: and yet our material must be so arranged that it can in practice be adjusted and modified into a shape fit for handling in the class of many grades. Our plan must be theoretically complete but practically simple. If it is right, and if the little school can be brought to appreciate its rightness, we need not fear as to its success.

Such being the educational situation in the little Sunday school, what shall be its curriculum? We may attack this problem in two ways. We may draft a curriculum devised especially to fit the Sunday school of fifty members and five classes; in which case the completion of this difficult and somewhat indeterminate task will be but the prologue to the larger task of preparing and publishing in absolutely ready-made form the materials and guides for teachers and pupils; and that will in turn be but the opening step in a campaign of education and promotion in which we shall grow gray and pass from

the scene with but a minor fraction of our task accomplished. Or we can frankly recognize the fact that the one absolute and universal typical characteristic of the little Sunday school, *semper, ubique et ab omnibus,* is its educational inertia. There is good hope of getting it to react to an educational stimulus when that appears in the shape of an attractive proposition, complete and ready to use, low-priced, reasonable from the school's own point of view, indorsed by its denominational authorities, brought literally to its door, and forced home upon its attention by the determined and united efforts of the leaders in its field. But of getting the little Sunday school to come into the market and take our new curriculum and apparatus on its pedagogical merits there is no hope whatever. Our scheme must indeed be pedagogically meritorious; but its pedagogy must never be depended on as its attractive feature, the point of contact wherewith we are to win for it the attention and favor of the little school. If our discussion is to have any sort of relation to the actual little Sunday schools of North America, we must consider not the curriculum which is pedagogically ideal, but that which is politically available. Is there in existence or in project a curriculum sufficiently pedagogical to command our support, sufficiently detailed and objective to be considered as an available offer to the workers in a little school, and sufficiently supported to give promise of being or becoming a general and controlling impulse throughout the field?

The new graded lessons now being issued by the International Lesson Committee constitute the basis of exactly such a proposition. As originally drafted by the Graded Lessons Conference presided over by Mrs. Barnes, their pedagogic merits may, I think, safely be conceded. A better course might be drafted, no doubt; but this course has to be both good and available; it must win a favorable verdict from a jury of critics composed of several million Christians, each of whom considers himself an expert in his way, and whose peculiarities and predilections are not to be comprehended by intellects as feeble and unimaginative as ours. The Lesson Committee, in editing the drafts, has done its best to meet these idiosyncrasies; and we must be grateful for their service to the graded lessons, even where they seem to some of us to have lowered unduly the pedagogic value of the topics and material.

The problem of the little school's curriculum is not yet solved; but these International graded lessons furnish us with the means for its solution. The lessons in their present arrangement and printed form are not an ideal proposition for the school of fifty members. They

need to be re-edited for use in the loosely graded class. After the standard issues at current textbook prices have been completed, ways must be found to simplify and cheapen the forms without reducing their educational value; and as the circulation rises this can be done. The course being primarily cultural, supplemental information courses must be added as a convenient basis for the mechanics of grading and promotion. Certain present disputes must be settled, perhaps on the basis of a wise alternative arrangement. When these and a few other services have been performed, the way will be clear for the great majority of Sunday-school workers in each denomination and in the International service to come solidly together for such a campaign as will, not in ten but in five years, perhaps in three, carry a truly graded curriculum into more than half the little Sunday schools of North America.

THE SMALL SUNDAY SCHOOL.

THE VALUE OF ITS INSPIRATIONAL LIFE.

REV. CARLETON P. MILLS, PH.D.,
Educational Secretary, Diocese of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.

This subject, like most others, sets in motion several preliminary questions which should be answered before we can fairly attack the main question.

1. What is a small school?
2. Why pick out the small school for special treatment?
3. What are the aims of the small Sunday School?
4. What do we mean by inspirational life?

It is evident that we cannot decide the place of inspirational life in the school until we have first answered these introductory questions.

No one has yet defined a small school; it is really a relative matter. What is regarded as small in one denomination or in one part of the country is thought of as large in another. Compared with the many schools in Philadelphia, having a membership of five or six hundred or even a thousand, most of the schools in New England seem small. No school is really small, if, by small, we mean lacking in opportunity. But extensively there is such a thing as a small Sunday school. Intensively there is no such thing. If for sake of definiteness we must

fix upon some measure of the small school, perhaps a fair average the country over is one hundred pupils and under. Fifty, however, would suit as well the purposes of this paper.

But why pick out the small school at all for special treatment? Is the difference between a small and a large school such as to make it necessary to put the former in a class by itself? In my judgment the difference is quite superficial. It does not reach principles, only methods. I venture the guess that the subject of the small school was prompted by the feeling, found in many quarters, that the modern Sunday-school movement, implying the application of educational principles, while all right for the large school, is a menace to the small school. Perhaps this conference can do something to meet and remove this prejudice. I should like to record my opinion, based on the observation of many schools, large and small, that this distinction is much overworked. In order to apply to the small schools the principles that should govern all school management, of course adaptations in method are necessary, but not different principles. I could cite many concrete cases to show that the small school has the same opportunities as the large school for the application, although with method duly modified, of thorough organization, a carefully selected curriculum at once definite, comprehensive and progressive, and a high standard of teacher training; and that thus its inspirational life is not impaired, but quickened.

But what are the aims of the small Sunday school? They may all be reduced to one single aim. Instruction, training, the kindling of a desire to realize Christian ideals, may all be resolved into personal allegiance to Christ and His Church and to His service in helping to establish the Kingdom of God upon the earth. This, indeed, is the aim of all schools, whether large or small; and once more the distinction appears to be unnecessary.

Agreeing, then, that the aim is personal allegiance to Christ and that the difference between the small and the large school is one of method and not of principle, just what do we mean by inspirational life? I shall not attempt a definition. I doubt whether a satisfactory definition could be framed, because the content of these words is so subtle, so pervasive and so fundamental in the entire work and life of the school that it evades definition. It is like electricity. We see its results, we know more or less how to direct its energy, but we do not know what it is.

The inspirational life of the school is certainly *not* a direct result of any single activity or method, nor confined to any department. It

is rather a spirit that runs through all departments and through all activities. It is a result of doing certain things well, each of which has something else as its direct purpose. The main purpose of instruction, for example, is to impart knowledge, but the best instruction is also inspiring. One can point out all the other elements of the school with definiteness. This you cannot put your finger upon. If we enter the Sunday school and try to discover all its appointments, methods and agents, we can easily point them all out except this, its inspirational life. You cannot open a door and say "Come now into the Inspirational Department of the Sunday School." The school must be inspiring through and through or else, as a school, it is not inspiring at all. Without inspiration all else falls short, and yet it in turn is not the result of direct aim, but rather the indirect result of all the co-operating agents performing satisfactorily their respective functions.

Inspirational life is not to be sought for directly, but comes as a by-product. Having stated this, I feel that I can without danger of being misunderstood make three suggestions which may help to put the matter in a somewhat more constructive way.

SOURCES OF INSPIRATION.

Inspiration springs from people and not from methods or from organization. It will emanate from the persons who are responsible for setting the standards, for leading and teaching. The superintendent, the officers and the teachers are the people from whom inspiration must come; and, they will inspire not by attempting to be inspiration, but rather by being most efficient in the direct work that falls to them. The teachers in turn, by taking their work seriously and by doing their utmost to teach well, are helping to create an inspiring atmosphere. The best way is not to try to be inspirational, but to strive for excellence as a teacher. Personality is the main factor in successful teaching and in enabling the teacher to be inspiring. But there is danger in this cry for personality. It seems sometimes to rule out of service and leadership all except those who have what we call great personality, some unusual natural endowment, whereas what we need to emphasize is, that any teacher animated by the right motive and willing to subject himself to the conditions necessary for helpful influence upon others, may be an inspiring personality. The source of inspiration, then, will be the character, the spirit and the work of the leaders and the teachers.

INSPIRATION FOSTERED.

The worship of the school may be a means of fostering and developing inspirational life. But we have not yet realized even in any small degree, the possibility that lies in worship as an aid in the religious development of the child. The subject is fraught with difficulty, both theoretical and practical, and yet it is one which must be taken up with thoroughness and with determination to apply to it sound pedagogical principles. I will merely indicate certain requirements that must be met in working out the problem of worship as an aid in religious development. In the *first* place, worship should be such as to provide that the child can be present, not only in body but in interest and attention. For children to attend church services in which they are simply occupying a certain amount of space in the pew, while really they are far away in imagination and interst, means the loss of a great opportunity for helping the child. In the *second* place, the worship should be such that the child can take part in it. He must not only be present with attention and interest, he must also be able to participate. In fact, interest and attention will depend very greatly upon participation. Evidently a great deal of the worship to which young children, under the age of twelve years, are brought, and which they are expected to find of value and which is expected by their elders to be of value and interest to them, is of such a kind that they really can have little or no real share in it, simply because it is out of their range. At the present time there is nothing of ascertained value that can be generally recommended as the type of service best suited to meet the needs of the child. A *third* consideration in this matter of worship, is the unity of the family. How can a service be provided that shall secure the interest of the child, making it certain that he will be present and that he will take part and that at the same time will not necessitate segregating the children, thereby destroying the unity of the family, in the matter of church worship? I have merely a theoretical suggestion to make, namely, that the difficulty will be met only when the parents come to feel so strongly the need of the children having worship that is their own, and at the same time so strongly the importance of keeping the family together in the church worship, that the parents themselves will be willing, for a part of each Sunday to come to church *with the children,* instead of calling upon the children to go to church with the parents, as has been almost universally the case in the past. The child cannot to his highest spiritual advantage go to church with the parents. On the other hand, the parents would not in any degree suffer loss by entering into the

child's worship through a service especially adapted to meet the child's life. I am hoping that some time some one will put this reversal of the usual order into actual practice and that parents will be invited and urged to come to church with their children.

In the *third* place a fine inspirational tone may be given to a school through the reflex action upon it of certain forms of activity. Whatever is done by any of us that is in itself helpful to other people is not only good because of its helpfulness, but is also good because of the return which comes back into our own lives. This is true to such an extent and in such a wide field that many people feel today that the whole Christian church in the United States is to look for its own salvation through the reaction upon it of its missionary zeal and enterprise. This, of course, is an illustration of a clearly recognized pedagogical principal, that knowledge and duty and ideals are barren until they have taken on life through expression in some form of action. Therefore, that school which is building up this life, not alone through making its instruction sound and thorough and by setting before the pupils the inspiration of exemplary Christian living, but is in addition giving careful direction on definite Christian work, is likely to reap the largest result in a deep and vital inspirational life of its own. The directions which this activity in Sunday school can take are varied, depending in a great measure upon the surroundings and the opportunities offered to the school by the particular community in which it is placed. Christmas, for example, has become a new day and rich with a new kind of joy since it has been turned in many places from a getting Christmas into a giving Christmas. The happiest part of the whole day for the boys and girls themselves is that when they carry the gifts brought to the Christmas tree out to the hospitals or the homes of the destitute or to the sick.

Then, there is a new interpretation of the place of missions in the Sunday school, so practical and interesting as to constitute almost a pedagogical discovery. As a result the Sunday school, through sharing in its own way in this effort to carry the Christian heritage out to those members of the family who have not yet received it, is opening a new and inexhaustible source of inspiration.

THE SMALL SUNDAY SCHOOL.

ITS PPOBLEMS OF TEACHER TRAINING.

FRANKLIN W. MCELFRESH, PH.D.,
Teacher Training Secretary International Sunday School Association, Chicago, Illinois.

The average enrollment of Sunday schools in America is ninety. The problem of the small school is the problem of the majority of schools then. It furnishes by far the largest number of religious workers; it receives a small share of encouragement from religious leaders; and it has peculiar discouragements.

The specific problem is this: How can the Sunday school, with an enrollment of a hundred or less, with an average attendance of fifty or sixty, assembling in one room, maintain the teacher-training class successfully?

THE CLASS IN THE SCHOOL.

It can organize a class by a selection of pupils sixteen years of age and beyond, and give this class a continuous life in the school. This provides the teachers for tomorrow. Not only does it forecast the future in this essential, but it appeals to the strongest and most deeply religious among its young life at the very day when they are most willing to give themselves to service. This class should enter upon a definite course of study for one or two years. It should receive all encouragement from the minister and superintendent, and, indeed, from the whole church. It should receive the most cordial public recognition and be surrounded by all the comfort and good cheer that can possibly be given those who are doing work of the highest honor to the cause of religion. It should be given the social encouragement that comes from happy events. It should be given the best available teacher. It should be asked to do thorough work and receive the drill and discipline of extended periods of study with careful examinations, and finally receive certificate or diploma at the completion of the course. These young people will respect high standards. If they have heard at all the Master's call for service, they long to be skilled workmen and to win success. Their graduation should be one of the events of the church year. All of this can be done with a class of less than ten; indeed, four or five can follow this work successfully.

THE WEEK-DAY CLASS

For the teachers already at work in the school, this plan of study at the time of the Sunday-school session is impossible, and their work must be done at a week-day hour. The simple fact that many of the most successful teacher-training classes have carried forward their work in the busiest cities, is ample proof that the work can be done anywhere if there be real willingness of heart. In the country, groups can meet at private homes or at the church, and for eight or nine months in the year pursue this work with little interruption. In the village the hindrances are less than the Sunday-school worker finds in the longer distances and more crowded life in the city.

It may be more difficult to find a teacher for the training class in the small church than it is in the large one. The minister often must take this as a new duty and a new privilege offered in his own life. More than one-half of the classes, in fact, are taught by ministers. Many talented teachers of the public schools or high schools are willing, out of a deep Christian purpose of heart, to devote time to work that is specifically religious. And there is a vast amount of unused and untrained talent everywhere that can be brought into service when very plain, definite and thorough work is placed before them.

UNION CLASSES.

In some cases a union class can be formed in the county or village community by bringing teachers of several schools together. In this case, careful organization of the class by selection of president and others who will bind its members by close ties and maintain a spirit of faithful work is absolutely essential. Where the individual student is desirous of taking this work, a correspondence method can be made very helpful, provided there is patience and deep determination in carrying the course through to the end. There will be much loss, of course, in this plan from the lack of discussion and inspiration that belong to every earnest group, but much information may be gained. Only those who are earnestly seeking it will be inclined to take this study alone.

The problem of the small school comes back after all to the problem of the isolated Christian worker. The busy men and women who are called to teach religion are often left so much alone that they fail to receive the higher inspiration and joy that really belong to their service. And there can be no higher duty of religious leadership than to reveal to these more lonely workers in the quiet fields the possibilities of success and the high responsibilities that are upon them. Isola-

tion may mean intellectual stagnation and mental torpor, or it may give opportunity for the quiet of deep thought and the brooding and self-development that produces the most sturdy and self-respecting character. There is no higher service offered today than that given the intelligent, earnest Bible teacher. The dignity of such work, the intellectual heights of such study, rescue the isolated worker from the danger of drudgery. If the farmer can turn his furrow, with the Shepherd Psalm and the messages of the herdsmen of Tekoa in mind, he will be redeemed from that sordidness of soul revealed in some recent facts regarding the moral backwardness of rural life. If the village workman can follow the tent-maker of Tarsus and the fishermen of Galilee in their spiritual heights, he will be trained as a fisher of men and a winner of souls, and lifted far above the mere hewer of wood or the cog in the industrial machine. If the teaching of Bible stories possesses the heart of the worker in the kitchen or shop or store, she can lift her eyes from the monotony of her task to a realm of poetry and ideal beauty which she can interpret to the child life about her. Herbert's fine phrase about "making drudgery divine" applies splendidly here. Men and women in quiet places, lacking the splendid inducements and enthusiasms of great classes and schools, must see that the highest success in work lies before them; and that the work itself will give a new dignity and meaning to their own lives So we must appeal to them for a thoroughness and earnestness in study, not only for the sacredness of the task, but for the sake of the workmen as well.

Whoever sees the real tomorrow sees the moral issue is the pivotal question. The only question in American influence is regarding the honesty and deep loyalty of heart to Christian standards. The moral issue comes back for inspiration and authority to Christian teaching. The richest chance for Christian teaching is in the Sunday school, and upon the schools in the country and the small school depends, in the largest degree, the Christian type of our national character. One great service leader in religious education can render is to restore the joy, the self-respect and the spiritual vigor of the country church; and the Sunday school is the most direct avenue of approach. In no way can this be done so rapidly or so effectively as by the awakening of the country Sunday school to lift its eyes and see the abundant opportunities for success that lie right at its doors.

LOOK THROUGH YOUR FILES.

Early numbers of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION are now out of print. For some of these there is a steady demand; libraries in particular desire to complete their sets. We need, and *will pay for,* copies of

Vol. I, No. 1, April, 1906.
Vol. IV, No. 1, April, 1909.
Vol. IV, No. 2, June, 1909.
Vol. IV, No. 4, October, 1909.
Vol. V, No. 2, June, 1910.
Vol. VI, No. 1, April, 1911.

You may have extra copies of these on hand. The demand has been so large for back numbers that we will be grateful to receive any but can pay only for those listed above.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago.

IS THIS THE WAY?

An outline for an "illustrated lesson in morals," for boys 15 to 19 years of age, on their sex problems. To be based on 90 photographs from real life, showing the "wisdom of experience" and explaining the "code in vogue among true men."

Title: *A Man's Honor Toward Women.*

1. Be content in youth.
2. Prepare for marriage by purity of mind and body.
3. Realize the ideal marriage.
4. Be true to your home.
5. Bring up the children healthy, intelligent and righteous.
6. Be respectful and courteous to all women.

Correspondence stating the ideas which it is thought ought to go into this lesson is much desired. Is the wording of the "code" satisfactory? Is the code complete? Will it serve as a chart to guide the boys through life? Is it true to the opinion of men and women of intelligence and will it receive public sanction and support from parents? Is there anything in it that ought not to be brought before boys of fifteen years of age?

Please write fully your thoughts on this matter of sex education of boys, giving suggestions as to what ought and what ought not to go into an illustrated lesson designed to strengthen the boys against temptation.

Address, National Institution for Moral Instruction, Milton Fairchild, Director of Instruction, 507 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

Moral Education.

Can Virtue be Taught? E. O. Sisson. Educ. R. 41:261-79. Mr. '11.

Methods of Reducing Moral Truths to Practice. H. H. Cummings. Natl. Educ. Assn. 1910:180-5.

Moral Education Conference. F. W. Johnson. School R. 19: 347-9. My. '11.

Moral Training of Private-School Boys. C. K. Taylor. Educa. 41:541-7. Apr. '11.

Variable Factors in Moral Responsibility. P. W. Horn. Nat. Educ. Assn. 1910:169-74.

Moral Progress in Public Educ. Western J. of E. 1911:129. Mar. '11.

Public Schools and Religion.

High Churchmen and Elementary Education. D. C. Lathbury. Contemp. 99:182-7. F. '11.

Religious Freedom in the Schools. H. M. Leonard. Educ. 31: 218-23. D. '10.

State, School and Church in France. D. Muzzy. Sch. Rev. 19: 318-32. May '11.

Religion, Psychology of.

Faith and its Psychology. W. R. Inge. Review. Bibbert J. 9: 212-5. O. '10.

Influence of Psychology upon Theology. C. A. Beckwith. Amer. J. Theol. 15:194-204. Ap. '11.

Psychological Aspects of Regeneration. T. G. Soares. Bib. World 37:78-88. F. '11.

Religion from the Standpoint of Functional Psychology. G. A. Coe. Amer. J. Theol. 15:301-8. Ap. '11.

Psychological Explanation of Religion. E. S. Ames. Am. J. Theol. 15:152-6. Ja. '11.

Religious Education.

Child Nurture and Education in Catholic Schools. J. J. McCoy. Child Conf. for Research 1910:72-83.

Historical Significance of the Religious Problem in the German Schools. A. B. Show. Educa. 31:423-36. Mr. '11.

Movement for Reform in the Teaching of Religion in the Public Schools of Saxony. A. B. Show. Bibliog. U. S. Bur. Educ. Bul. 1910 1:1-45.

Toward Educational Righteousness. C. T. D. Acland. 19th Cent. 69:169-74. Ja. '11.